

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUMIT GARG,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR21-0045-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 844) of this Court's order denying Defendant's request to dismiss his case on constitutional grounds (Dkt. No. 752). Having thoroughly considered the relevant record, the Court hereby DENIES Defendant's motion for the reasons explained herein.

Under the Local Criminal Rules, "[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored." CrR12(b)(13)(A). "The Court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.* "A motion for reconsideration should not be used to ask the court to rethink what the court had already thought through—rightly or wrongly." *Ma v. Univ. of S. California*, 2019 WL 1239269, slip op. at 1 (W.D. Wash. 2019).

1 Here, Defendant asks the Court to reconsider its ruling denying his motion to dismiss his  
2 case. (Dkt. No. 844.) In that motion, Defendant asserted sweeping constitutional claims for  
3 which he sought the dismissal of the charges against him. (*See* Dkt. No. 652.) Defendant fails to  
4 demonstrate manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority, as  
5 required by LCR 7(h)(1). Instead, Defendant merely reiterates previously considered arguments  
6 that the Court rejected. (*Compare* Dkt. No. 652 at 2–6, *with* Dkt. Nos. 776, 844 at 3–8.)

7 Accordingly, Defendant’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 844) is DENIED.  
8  
9

10 DATED this 11th day of March 2024.

11  
12  
13 

14 John C. Coughenour  
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26